



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,655	08/21/2001	Chinmei Chen Lee	34-17	6676
46290	7590	09/25/2007	EXAMINER	
WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON 10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100 HOUSTON, TX 77042				CZEKAJ, DAVID J
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2621		
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
		09/25/2007 PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/933,655	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner Dave Czekaj	Art Unit 2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-21 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but before the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/16/07 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 and 11-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-2, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez et al. (6697103), (hereinafter referred to as "Fernandez") in view of Coles (5712679).

Regarding claim 1, Fernandez discloses an apparatus that relates to remote surveillance and communications technology (Fernandez: column 1, lines 6-8). This apparatus comprises "receiving a request from a mobile terminal" (Fernandez: column 8, lines 20-23, wherein the mobile terminal is the controller, column 9, lines 1-5, wherein the request is the user selection of the desired objects), "identifying the area that is to be identified" (Fernandez: column 4, lines 3-9, wherein common areas are identified, column 9, lines 1-5, wherein the identification is performed by the user selecting the appropriate site or link), and "orienting equipment to effect surveillance of the identified area" (Fernandez: column 4, lines 57-61, wherein orienting equipment is adjusting the pan, tilt, or focus). However, this apparatus lacks identifying the area as a function of a geographical position of the mobile terminal. Coles teaches that providing the geographical position of a mobile terminal helps warn the correct people of potential dangers (Coles: column 2, lines 1-22; column 2, line 65 – column 3, line 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Fernandez and add the location determination taught by Coles in order to help prevent a dangerous situation by alerting the proper individuals.

Regarding claim 2, Fernandez discloses "using information from the mobile terminal to identify the area to be under surveillance" (Fernandez: column 8, lines 20-23, wherein the mobile terminal is the controller, column 9, lines 1-5, wherein the information is the data corresponding to the user selection).

Regarding claims 18 and 21, note the examiners rejection for claim 1, and in addition, Fernandez discloses "video surveillance equipment coupled to a network" (Fernandez: figure 1; column 4, lines 23-27).

2. Claims 3-10, 12-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez et al. (6697103), (hereinafter referred to as "Fernandez") in view of Coles (5712679) in further view of Kawai et al. (6137485), (hereinafter referred to as "Kawai").

Regarding claim 3, note the examiners rejection for claim 1 and in addition, claim 3 differs from claim 1 in that claim 3 further requires using information from a base station to identify an area to be under surveillance.

Kawai teaches that it is well known to use information from a base station to select images for surveillance (Kawai: column 1, lines 24-46, wherein the base station is where the user terminal is located, the information is the user selection for the specified camera. By selecting the camera, the user is identifying an area to be under surveillance). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the information from the base station taught by Kawai in order to obtain an apparatus that better helps identify an area to be monitored by supplying information from a base station.

Regarding claims 4 and 20, Fernandez discloses "the wireless telecommunication system uses information from GPS to identify the area that is to be under surveillance" (Fernandez: column 7, lines 30-40, wherein the

telecommunication system is the cellular phone radio connectivity, column 12, lines 40-49, wherein the GPS provides location information).

Regarding claims 5 and 8-9, Fernandez in view of Coles disclose "using the location of the terminal to orient a camera to focus in on the terminal" (Fernandez: column 4, lines 57-61, wherein orienting equipment is adjusting the pan, tilt, or focus; Coles: column 2, lines 1-22; column 2, line 65 – column 3, line 3, wherein the location is determined and transmitted).

Regarding claim 6, Fernandez discloses "the location of the mobile terminal is determined from global position satellite signals" (Fernandez: column 10, lines 36-42, wherein the controller is equipped with a GPS receiver).

Regarding claim 7, Fernandez discloses "the location of the terminal is determined from the wireless network" (Fernandez: column 10, lines 36-42, wherein the wireless network is the GPS network).

Regarding claim 10, Fernandez discloses "the equipment used to effect surveillance" (Fernandez: column 4, lines 57-61, wherein adjusting the pan, tilt, or focus is effecting surveillance).

Regarding claim 12, Fernandez discloses "the equipment used to effect surveillance remains focused for a fixed interval of time" (Fernandez: column 12, lines 50-67, wherein the fixed interval of time is the time the object is within view of the cameras).

Regarding claims 13 and 17, Fernandez discloses "making a recording of the area under surveillance" (Fernandez: column 9, lines 10-24, wherein the

database is equipped with a storage device array for recording various statistics and images).

Regarding claim 14, Fernandez discloses "the request for surveillance from the mobile terminal is effected by activation a menu and selecting an option from the menu" (Fernandez: column 9, lines 1-9, wherein the menu is the list of websites or icons and selecting an option is clicking or selecting on the desired website or link).

Regarding claims 15 and 16, although not disclosed, it would have been obvious to use a security code on the mobile terminal (Official Notice). Doing so would have been obvious in order to prevent unauthorized access to the system.

3. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez et al. (6697103), (hereinafter referred to as "Fernandez") in view of Coles (5712679) in further view of Nunally et al. (5917958), (hereinafter referred to as "Nunally").

Regarding claim 19, note the examiners rejection for claims 1 and 18, and in addition, claim 19 differs from claims 1 and 18 in that claim 19 further requires activating a menu and selecting a surveillance option from the menu. Nunally teaches that there is a need for more efficient and flexible surveillance systems (Nunally: column 2, lines 46-50). To help alleviate this problem, Nunally discloses "activating a menu and selecting a surveillance option from the menu" (Nunally: figures 136, 170, wherein the menu is the drop down menu, the option is the different tools to apply to the selected cameras). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the menu options taught by Nunally in order to obtain an apparatus that operates more efficiently by providing a security device that operates with greater flexibility by being able to customize different options for different cameras.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (571) 272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 09/933,655
Art Unit: 2621

Page 8



Dave Czekaj
TC 2600